

Child Welfare Outcomes and Measures

This document provides information about the child welfare outcomes and measures for **Child Welfare**

Child Welfare Outcome 1:

Reduce recurrence of child abuse and/or neglect

Measure 1.1: Of all children who were victims of substantiated or indicated child abuse and/or neglect during the first 6 months of the reporting period, what percentage had another substantiated or indicated report within a 6-month period?

Child Welfare Outcome 2:

Reduce the incidence of child abuse and/or neglect in foster care

Measure 2.1: Of all children who were in foster care during the reporting period, what percentage was the subject of substantiated or indicated maltreatment by a foster parent or facility staff?

Note: The reporting period for this measure is January 1 to September 30 (9 months).

Child Welfare Outcome 3:

Increase permanency for children in foster care

Measure 3.1: For all children who exited foster care, what percentage left either to reunification, adoption, or legal guardianship?

Measure 3.2: For children who exited foster care and were identified as having a diagnosed disability, what percentage left either to reunification, adoption, or legal guardianship?

Measure 3.3: For children who exited foster care and were older than age 12 at the time of their most recent entry into care, what percentage left either to reunification, adoption, or legal guardianship?

Measure 3.4: Of all children exiting foster care to emancipation, what percentage was age 12 or younger at the time of entry into care?

Measure 3.5: For all children who exited foster care, what percentage by racial/ethnic category left either to reunification, adoption, or legal guardianship?

Child Welfare Outcome 4:

Reduce time in foster care to reunification without increasing re-entry

Measure 4.1: Of all children who were reunified with their parents or caretakers at the time of discharge from foster care, what percentage was reunified in the following time periods?

- (1) Less than 12 months from the time of latest removal from home
- (2) At least 12 months, but less than 24 months
- (3) At least 24 months, but less than 36 months
- (4) At least 36 months, but less than 48 months
- (5) 48 or more months

Measure 4.2: Of all children who entered foster care during the reporting period, what percentage re-entered care:

- (1) Within 12 months of a prior foster care episode?
- (2) More than 12 months after a prior foster care episode?

**Child Welfare Outcome 5:
Reduce time in foster care to adoption**

Measure 5.1: Of all children who exited foster care to a finalized adoption, what percentage exited care in the following time periods?

- (1) Less than 12 months from the time of latest removal from home
- (2) At least 12 months, but less than 24 months
- (3) At least 24 months, but less than 36 months
- (4) At least 36 months, but less than 48 months
- (5) 48 or more months

**Child Welfare Outcome 6:
Increase placement stability**

Measure 6.1: Of all children served who had been in foster care for the time periods listed below, what percentage had no more than two placement settings during that time period?

- (1) Less than 12 months from the time of latest removal from home
- (2) At least 12 months, but less than 24 months
- (3) At least 24 months, but less than 36 months
- (4) At least 36 months, but less than 48 months
- (5) 48 or more months

**Child Welfare Outcome 7:
Reduce placements of young children in group homes or institutions**

Measure 7.1: For all children who entered foster care during the reporting period and were age 12 or younger at the time of their most recent placement, what percentage was placed in a group home or an institution?

ABOUT THE CASEY OUTCOMES AND DECISION-MAKING PROJECT

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

A group of organizations has joined forces to carry out a special project devoted to the use of a principle-driven, outcome-focused approach to decision making in child welfare services, and to the use of these concepts in managed care environments. The project is being carried out by a consortium funded by the Annie E. Casey Foundation/ Casey Family Services and The Casey Family Program. Other members of the consortium are the American Humane Association, American Bar Association Center on Children and the Law, and the Institute for Human Services Management.

Spearheaded by the American Humane Association, the consortium will develop three major products that will serve as a part of a foundation for building a responsive managed care approach to child welfare:

- I. **Service Philosophy.** A separate product, *Assessing Outcomes in Child Welfare Services: Principles, Concepts, and a Framework of Core Outcome Indicators*, produced by this project contains a succinct statement of philosophical and conceptual principles that identify the common values and basic tenets of social services for children and families. Its goal is to serve as a principled starting point from which to frame both the outcomes that the system is trying to achieve for children and families and the decision-making guidelines for reaching those outcomes. For example, principles include maintaining child safety, promoting child development, and preserving family ties when possible.
- II. **Outcomes Framework.** The Outcomes framework for children's services (Section III of *Assessing Outcomes in Child Welfare Services: Principles, Concepts, and a Framework of Core Outcome Indicators*) provides a domain organization and a listing of suggested core outcome indicators for child welfare services. The framework can be used by programs such as child protective services, family-based services, and family foster care and residential treatment providers to launch the development of outcome measures specific to their own communities or programs. Examples of key indicators include reduction of family violence; increase of parenting skills and employment; and maintenance of adequate levels of child school attendance and behavior in the home, school, and community. A discussion of the current state-of-the-art in outcome measurement for child welfare services is provided in Section II of the *Assessing Outcomes in Child Welfare Services* monograph.
- III. **Decision-Making Guidelines.** A separate publication (under development) will provide case-level guidelines for making decisions about the outcomes desired for children and families served by the system and what services might be most effective for different kinds of family situations.

EXECUTIVE MANAGEMENT TEAM

Peter J. Pecora (Chair), Joy Duva, John Fluke, Hildy Hjermsstad, Patrick McCarthy, Amy Winterfeld.

PROJECT ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Ira Barbell, Fred Chaffee, Lisa Conlan, Joy Duva, Tracey Feild, John Fluke, James Gannaway, Mark Hardin, Hildy Hjermsstad, Mareasa Isaacs, Ivory Johnson, John Mattingly, Patrick McCarthy, Ann Morison Murphy, Hon. Jean Shepherd, Elaine Szymoniak, Jessica Watson-Crosby, Amy Winterfeld.

OUTCOMES WORK GROUP

John Fluke (Chair), Hansine Fisher, Tracey Feild, Mark Hardin, Nancy McDaniel, Ann Murphy, Peter Pecora, Amy Winterfeld.

PHILOSOPHY WORK GROUP

Amy Winterfeld (Chair), Tracey Feild, Mark Hardin, Hildy Hjermsstad, Ann Morison Murphy, Peter Pecora, Hon. Jean Shepherd, Jessica Watson-Crosby.

DECISION MAKING WORK GROUP

Tracey Feild (Chair), Joy Duva, Hansine Fisher, James Gannaway, Mark Hardin, John Mattingly, Amy Winterfeld.

incorporates relevant information from the analysis of CFSR findings for the 32 States that participated in a CFSR during FYs 2001 and 2002.

CHILD WELFARE OUTCOMES 2001: ANNUAL REPORT TO CONGRESS EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Child Welfare Outcomes 2001: Annual Report to Congress (Outcomes Report) is the fourth annual report from the U.S.

Department of Health and Human Services (the Department). This report depicts the performance of States on the following

seven national child welfare outcomes:

- Reduce recurrence of child abuse and/or neglect,
- Reduce the incidence of child abuse and/or neglect in foster care,
- Increase permanency for children in foster care,
- Reduce time in foster care to reunification without increasing re-entry,
- Reduce time in foster care to adoption,
- Increase placement stability, and
- Reduce placements of young children in group homes or institutions.

Child Welfare Outcomes 2001 presents data for each State (the term "State" as it is used in this report, includes the 50 States

and the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico) on each of the 12 measures developed to assess the 7 national outcomes.

The report also provides key findings of a cross-State data analyses and a discussion of overall State performance on the outcome measures.

The discussion of State performance incorporates information from the Department's Child and Family Services Reviews

(CFSR) for the 32 States reviewed in fiscal years 2001 and 2002. Although the Outcome Reports and the CFSR represent

separate activities within the Department, both are designed to provide information that the Department can use to assist States

in improving child welfare services. The CFSR is the Department's results-oriented, comprehensive monitoring system

implemented in fiscal year (FY) 2001. The CFSR examines State child welfare system operations through case reviews and

interviews with stakeholders and assesses each State's conformity with seven outcomes and seven systemic factors. The CFSR

also assesses each State's performance on 6 outcome measures that the Department selected from the 13 measures developed for

the Outcomes Reports. Prior to implementation of the CFSR, the Department established national standards for these six

measures, and States are assessed with respect to whether their Statewide data for the measure meets the national standard.

Child Welfare Outcomes 2001 is organized as follows:

- **Chapter I. Assisting States in Attaining Positive Outcomes for Children and Families.** This chapter focuses on

how the Department can and does use information from the Outcomes Reports and the CFSR to assist States in improving

their efforts to achieve positive outcomes for children and families.

- **Chapter II. Key Findings Pertaining to State Performances on the National Child Welfare Outcomes.** This

chapter presents the findings of the analyses of State data with regard to the seven outcome measures. The analyses focus on

performance in 2001 and changes in performance from 1999 to 2001.

• **Chapter III. Assessment of State Performance on the Seven Child Welfare Outcomes.** This chapter provides a discussion of the key findings and the implications of the findings for assessing State performance. The discussion incorporates relevant information from the analysis of CFSR findings for the 32 States that participated in a CFSR during FYs 2001 and 2002.

• **Chapter IV. State Data Pages.** The data pages for each State are provided in this Chapter. For each State, the data pages are followed by a State comment page (for those States providing comments) and a Federal comment page.

The data analyses conducted for *Child Welfare Outcomes 2001* focused on State performance on the outcomes in 2001 and changes in performance from 1999 to 2001. The data analyses address State performance in the following areas:

- Preventing further maltreatment of child victims (defined as children who were the subject of a substantiated or indicated maltreatment report);

- Achieving permanency for all children in foster care;

- Achieving permanency for children in foster care in a timely manner; and

- Ensuring stable and age-appropriate foster care placements for children.

Key findings pertaining to State performance with regard to each of these areas are summarized below.

State Performance Pertaining to Preventing Further Maltreatment of Children

Children's safety is the primary concern of all child welfare services, particularly the safety of children who have already been

identified as maltreatment victims—i.e., children who were the subjects of substantiated or indicated maltreatment reports. The

Department established the following outcomes to address this concern: outcome 1: reduce recurrence of child abuse and/or

neglect, and outcome 2: reduce the incidence of child abuse and/or neglect in foster care.

To assess outcome 1, outcome measure 1.1 was developed: For all children who were victims of substantiated or indicated

child abuse and/or neglect during the first 6 months of the reporting period, what percentage had another substantiated or

indicated report within a 6-month period? The Department established the following national standard related to this measure

as part of the CFSR: Of all children who were victims of substantiated or indicated child abuse or neglect during the first 6

months of a specified year, 6.1 percent or fewer children had another substantiated or indicated report within 6 months.

To assess outcome 2, outcome measure 2.1 was developed: Of all children who were in foster care during the reporting period,

what percentage was the subject of substantiated or indicated maltreatment by a foster parent or facility staff member? The

Department established the following national standard related to this measure for the CFSR: Of all children in foster care in

the State during a specified time period, 0.57 percent or fewer were the subject of substantiated or indicated maltreatment by a

foster parent or facility staff member.

A key finding with regard to outcome measure 1 is that many States experience challenges in preventing maltreatment

recurrence. In 2001, of the 40 States reporting data for the outcome measure assessing maltreatment recurrence within 6

months, only 13 (32.5 percent) met the national standard of 6.1 percent or less. Ten States (25 percent) had a maltreatment

recurrence rate that was greater than 10 percent. In contrast to these findings, States appear to be experiencing greater success in preventing maltreatment of children in foster care. In 2001, for example, of the 38 States reporting data for the measure assessing maltreatment in foster care, 25 (66 percent) met the national standard of 0.57 percent or less. There were only four States in which the incidence of maltreatment of children in foster care in 2001 exceeded one percent. In addition, there was a substantial increase from 1999 to 2001 in the percentage of States meeting the national standard for this measure (52 percent in 1999 compared to 66 percent in 2001).

Information from the analysis of data from the CFSR Final Reports suggests that the difficulties States experience in preventing

maltreatment recurrence may be due to one or more of the following:

- Risk assessments that are inadequate with respect to identifying underlying family issues such as substance abuse and domestic violence;
- A lack of services that sufficiently address risk issues (such as providing parenting education services when parents have domestic violence problems); and
- Insufficient monitoring of families to assess service participation and change in risk factors in child welfare cases in which children remain in their homes.

In addition, information from the analysis of the 32 CFSR Final Reports suggests that a State's success in preventing

maltreatment in foster care may be attributed in part to efforts to establish licensing standards for foster homes and care facilities that require adequate training for foster parents and facility staff and that ensure children's safety.

State Performance in Achieving Permanency for Children in Foster Care

A primary goal of child welfare services is to find permanent homes for children through reunification with their families,

adoption, or legal guardianship. The Department assesses State performance in achieving permanency for children in foster care

through five measures developed for outcome 3—increase permanency for children in foster care. The five measures are listed

below (no national standards are related to measures of outcome 3):

- Outcome measure 3.1: For all children who exited foster care during the reporting period, what percentage left either to reunification, adoption, or legal guardianship?
- Outcome measure 3.2: For children who exited foster care and were identified as having a diagnosed disability, what percentage left either to reunification, adoption, or legal guardianship?
- Outcome measure 3.3: For children who exited foster care and were older than age 12 at the time of their most recent entry into care, what percentage left either to reunification, adoption, or legal guardianship?
- Outcome measure 3.4: Of all children exiting foster care to emancipation, what percentage was age 12 or younger at the time of entry into foster care?
- Outcome measure 3.5: For all children who exited foster care, what percentage by racial/ethnic category left either to reunification, adoption, or legal guardianship?

A key finding pertaining to permanency for children in foster care is that the vast majority of children who exit foster care are discharged to a permanent home (i.e., through reunification, adoption, or guardianship). Children who are not included in this

group are those who were emancipated from foster care, transferred to another system (such as mental health, juvenile justice, or adults with disabilities), died, or ran away and were no longer considered by the State to be in out-of-home care. The mean percentage of children exiting foster care to a permanent home declines when the children have a diagnosed disability or when they entered foster care as adolescents. In FY 2001, the mean percentage of all children exiting foster care to a permanent home was 84.6. In comparison, the mean percentage of children with a diagnosed disability exiting foster care to a permanent home was only 78.4, and for children who entered foster care when they were adolescents, the mean percentage of children exiting to a permanent home declined even further, to 69.7. These findings suggest that achieving permanency for children with disabilities and children who entered foster care as adolescents is a challenge for many States. The analyses of CFSR Final Report information identified the following potential barriers to attaining permanency for older children:

- A perception of agency and court personnel that older children are “unadoptable” and that filing for termination of parental rights will only result in the creation of “legal orphans.”
- A tendency of child welfare agency personnel and courts to establish a case goal of long-term foster care when older children cannot be reunified with their parents without a thorough consideration of adoption or guardianship as permanency outcomes.
- A tendency among child welfare agency staff to focus service delivery on the child rather than involving the entire family when a child enters foster care at adolescence, particularly when the primary reason for entry into foster care is the child’s behavior.

Another key finding relevant to outcome measure 3.4 is that in many States a substantial percentage of children may be said to have “grown up” in foster care. That is, they were emancipated from foster care between the ages of 18 and 21 after having entered foster care when they were age 12 or younger. In FY 2001, there were 25 States in which more than 28 percent of the children emancipated from foster care were age 12 or younger when they entered foster care and in 15 of these States, over 50 percent of the children exiting to emancipation had entered foster care when they were age 12 or younger. Nationally, at least 30 percent of all children exiting foster care to emancipation in FY 1999, 2000, and 2001 were age 12 or younger when they entered foster care.

Information from the analysis of CFSR Final Reports suggests that young children are put at risk for “growing up” in foster care when the child welfare agency and/or the courts decide to maintain reunification as a permanency goal for long periods of time, even when parents have not exhibited progress in moving toward reunification and the prognosis for reunification is poor. Although some of the provisions of the Adoption and Safe Families Act (1997) are intended to address this problem, the CFSR findings suggest that not all States are fully implementing these provisions. A final key finding relevant to outcome measure 3 is that Black (non-Hispanic), White (non-Hispanic), and Hispanic children

are no more or less likely to be discharged from foster care to a permanent home. However, in five States, White (non-Hispanic) children exiting foster care were considerably more likely than Alaska Native/American Indian children to be discharged to a permanent home. In one of these States, 91.9 percent of White (non-Hispanic) children exiting foster care were discharged to a permanent home compared to 65.3 percent of Alaska Native/Native American children exiting foster care. Information from the CFSR Final Reports suggests that success in achieving positive outcomes for Native American children is promoted when States and Tribes establish written agreements about the roles and responsibilities of each entity for Native American children who come into contact with the child welfare system, and when the State child welfare agency and the courts adhere to the requirements of the Indian Child Welfare Act. However, information from the CFSR also indicates that some Tribes are unwilling to seek termination of parental rights for Native American children because it is not consistent with their cultural values and traditions, although they support permanency through long-term foster care in a stable home.

State Performance in Achieving Permanency in a Timely Manner

A primary goal of child welfare services is to achieve permanency for children in foster care as quickly as possible after a child enters foster care, without jeopardizing the child's continued safety. To address the issue of timely permanency, the Department established two outcomes: outcome 4—reduce time in foster care to reunification without increasing re-entry, and outcome 5—reduce time in foster care to adoption.

The measures developed to assess State performance in attaining outcome 4 are the following:

- Outcome measure 4.1: Of all children who were reunified with their parents or caretakers at the time of discharge from

foster care, what percentage was reunified in the following time periods?

- (1) Less than 12 months
- (2) At least 12 months but less than 24 months
- (3) At least 24 months but less than 36 months
- (4) At least 36 months but less than 48 months
- (5) 48 or more months

- Outcome measure 4.2: Of all children who entered foster care during the reporting period, what percentage re-entered care:

- (1) Within 12 months of a prior foster care episode?
- (2) More than 12 months after a prior foster care episode?

The Department established the following national standard for the CFSR related to outcome measure 4.1:

Of all children who

were reunified with their parents or caretakers at the time of discharge from foster care (in a specified fiscal year), 76.2 percent

or more were reunified in less than 12 months from the time of the latest removal from home. The

Department established the

following national standard for the CFSR related to outcome measure 4.2: Of all children who entered

foster care during a

specified fiscal year, 8.6 percent or fewer re-entered foster care within 12 months of discharge from a prior foster care episode.

The measure developed to assess State performance with regard to outcome 5 is the following: outcome measure 5.1. Of all

children who exited foster care to a finalized adoption, what percentage exited care in the following time periods?

- (1) Less than 12 months from the time of the latest removal from home

- (2) At least 12 months but less than 24 months
- (3) At least 24 months but less than 36 months
- (4) At least 36 months but less than 48 months
- (5) 48 or more months

The Department established the following national standard related to this measure for the CFSR: Of all children who exited foster care to a finalized adoption during the specified fiscal year, 32 percent or more exited foster care in less than 24 months from the time of the latest removal from the home.

A primary finding pertaining to the attainment of permanency in a timely manner is that States appear to be more successful in achieving reunifications in a timely manner (in less than 12 months) than they are in achieving adoptions in a timely manner

(in less than 24 months). In FY 2001, 19 (37 percent) of the 52 States met the national standard (76.2 percent or more) for the measure assessing the percentage of exits to reunification that occurred within 12 months of the child's entry into foster care.

In comparison, only 14 States (27 percent) met the national standard (32 percent or more) for the measure assessing the

percentage of finalized adoptions that occurred within 24 months of the child's entry into foster care. In addition, there was a substantive increase from FY 1999 to FY 2001 (+23 percent change) in the percentage of States meeting the national standard

for reunifications within 12 months, but there was a substantive decline from FY 1999 to FY 2001 (-12.9 percent change) in

the percentage of States meeting the national standard for finalized adoptions within 24 months. Finally, the data pertaining to adoptions within 24 months revealed a decline in both the mean and the median performance of States from FY 1999 to FY 2001.

Information from the analyses of the 32 CFSR Final Reports suggests that finalizing adoptions in a timely manner is a considerable challenge in most States. The identified barriers to expediting the adoption process included the following:

- Court-related barriers such as overcrowded dockets, the lengthy appeals process pertaining to termination of parental rights petitions, and insufficient attention of court personnel to permanency issues;
- Agency-related barriers including delays in completing paper work and conducting home studies; and
- An unwillingness on the part of agency and/or court personnel to terminate parental rights before an adoptive family has been found because they do not want to create "legal orphans."

Another finding concerns the relationship between State performance pertaining to timely reunification and performance

regarding foster care re-entry. Many States with a relatively high percentage of reunifications within 12 months also exhibit a

relatively high rate of re-entries into foster care within 12 months of a prior foster care episode; and many States with a

relatively low percentage of reunifications within 12 months exhibit a relatively low rate of re-entry into foster care. In fact, in

FY 2001, only four States met the national standards for both measures.

Information from the CFSR Final Reports indicates that re-entries into foster care may occur because many States lack

sufficient post-reunification services to support children's reintegration into the family and to monitor their safety on an

ongoing basis. In many States, moreover, the CFSR found that some reunifications occur before adequate changes have been

made in the family to ensure children's safety.

State Performance in Ensuring Stable and Age-Appropriate Placements for Children in Foster Care

Another goal of the child welfare system is to ensure that children in foster care experience placement stability and are in placements that are appropriate for their age. The Department established the following two outcomes to address these

concerns: outcome 6—increase placement stability, and outcome 7—reduce placements of young children in group homes or institutions.

The measure developed to assess State performance with regard to outcome 6 is the following: outcome measure 6.1: Of all

children served who had been in foster care for the time periods listed below, what percentage had no more than two

placement settings during that time period?

- (1) Less than 12 months from the time of latest removal from home
- (2) At least 12 months but less than 24 months
- (3) At least 24 months but less than 36 months
- (4) At least 36 months but less than 48 months
- (5) 48 or more months

The Department established the following national standard related to this measure for the CFSR: Of all children who have

been in foster care for less than 12 months from the time of the latest removal from the home, 86.7 percent or more have had

no more than 2 placement settings.

The measure developed to assess State performance with regard to outcome 7 is the following: outcome measure 7.1: For all

children who entered foster care during the reporting period and were age 12 or younger at the time of their most recent

placement, what percentage was placed in a group home or institution?

A key finding with regard to placement stability is that only 13 of the 52 States (25 percent) met the national standard for the

percentage of children in foster care for less than 12 months who experienced no more than 2 placements.

The analyses of

CFSR information identified the following concerns with respect to State effectiveness in ensuring placement stability for

children:

- There is frequent use in some States of shelter facilities as initial placements and/or as “temporary” placements when a placement disruption occurs or when an appropriate foster home cannot be located. Although a shelter placement may often be appropriate, the use of shelters as temporary or interim placements tends to contribute to placement instability.
- There is an insufficient supply of appropriate placement options for children, particularly for children with developmental disabilities or severe emotional/behavioral problems.
- There is a lack of services to foster families to prevent placement disruption when problems arise.
- There is inadequate matching of placements and children (i.e., the placement does not meet the child's needs or the foster parents' expectations).

A key finding pertaining to age-appropriate placements (outcome measure 7.1) is that, in FY 2001, there were 7 of the 52

States in which more than 20 percent of children entering foster care who were age 12 or younger were placed in a group

home or institution, and 1 State in which 45 percent of these children were placed in a group home or institution. In addition,

information from the CF SR Final Reports indicates that, in some States, children as young as 2 or 3 years old experience

extended stays in “shelter placements” that are equivalent to group homes or institutions.

Assessing Change in Performance Over Time

The findings of the analyses conducted for *Child Welfare Outcomes 2001* with regard to change in performance from FY 1999 to

FY 2001 suggest that it is too early in the outcome assessment process to identify trends in performance over time, either for

individual States or for States as a group. The most common finding of the analyses of change is that, for individual States, a

change in one direction from 1999 to 2000 was offset by a change in the other direction from 2000 to 2001.

The shift in

direction of the States from one year to the next is not unexpected given the fact that some States have implemented

improvements in collecting and reporting data in recent years, and that some States have been in the process of implementing a

change to a State Automated Child Welfare Information System from a legacy system.

It also is difficult at this time to differentiate changes over time that can be attributed to performance from those that are the

result of improvements in data quality. Through the CF SR process, and in response to the data for the Outcomes Reports,

many States re-examined the data they reported to the national data systems and discovered errors in their reporting

procedures. In some instances, this has resulted in resubmissions of prior years’ data to the Adoption and Foster Care Analysis

and Reporting System and the National Child Abuse and Neglect Data System. However, in other instances, States have

chosen not to resubmit data from prior years, but to make the corrections in future years. Consequently, for some States,

changes over time will not reflect the corrections made in the reporting procedures, while for other States, changes may be

Summary

The findings summarized above suggest that there is much room for improvement with regard to State performance on the

seven national child welfare outcomes. The Department’s role in helping States to improve their performance in attaining

positive outcomes for children and families is one of providing the necessary information and technical assistance. Information

about the effectiveness of various strategies, practices, policies, and procedures is critical to help ensure the success of the States

in their efforts to enhance outcomes. The Department’s comprehensive network of resource and information centers is geared

to meeting this demand, as is the research funded through discretionary grants. As the Department works with States in

developing their program-improvement plans as part of the CF SR, it is anticipated that performance on the outcome measures

will improve.

APPENDIX B-1

Child Welfare Outcomes and Measures

This document provides information about the child welfare outcomes and measures for **Child Welfare Outcomes 2001: Annual**

Report.

Child Welfare Outcome 1:

Reduce recurrence of child abuse and/or neglect

Measure 1.1: Of all children who were victims of substantiated or indicated child abuse and/or neglect during the first 6 months of

the reporting period, what percentage had another substantiated or indicated report within a 6-month period?

Child Welfare Outcome 2:

Reduce the incidence of child abuse and/or neglect in foster care

Measure 2.1: Of all children who were in foster care during the reporting period, what percentage was the subject of substantiated or indicated maltreatment by a foster parent or facility staff?

Note: The reporting period for this measure is January 1 to September 30 (9 months).

Child Welfare Outcome 3:

Increase permanency for children in foster care

Measure 3.1: For all children who exited foster care, what percentage left either to reunification, adoption, or legal guardianship?

Measure 3.2: For children who exited foster care and were identified as having a diagnosed disability, what percentage left either to reunification, adoption, or legal guardianship?

Measure 3.3: For children who exited foster care and were older than age 12 at the time of their most recent entry into care, what percentage left either to reunification, adoption, or legal guardianship?

Measure 3.4: Of all children exiting foster care to emancipation, what percentage was age 12 or younger at the time of entry into care?

Measure 3.5: For all children who exited foster care, what percentage by racial/ethnic category left either to reunification, adoption, or legal guardianship?

Child Welfare Outcome 4:

Reduce time in foster care to reunification without increasing re-entry

Measure 4.1: Of all children who were reunified with their parents or caretakers at the time of discharge from foster care, what percentage was reunified in the following time periods?

- (1) Less than 12 months from the time of latest removal from home
- (2) At least 12 months, but less than 24 months
- (3) At least 24 months, but less than 36 months
- (4) At least 36 months, but less than 48 months
- (5) 48 or more months

Measure 4.2: Of all children who entered foster care during the reporting period, what percentage re-entered care:

- (1) Within 12 months of a prior foster care episode?
- (2) More than 12 months after a prior foster care episode?

Child Welfare Outcome 5:

Reduce time in foster care to adoption

Measure 5.1: Of all children who exited foster care to a finalized adoption, what percentage exited care in the following time periods?

- (1) Less than 12 months from the time of latest removal from home
- (2) At least 12 months, but less than 24 months

(3) At least 24 months, but less than 36 months

(4) At least 36 months, but less than 48 months

(5) 48 or more months

Child Welfare Outcome 6:

Increase placement stability

Measure 6.1: Of all children served who had been in foster care for the time periods listed below, what percentage had no more than two placement settings during that time period?

- (1) Less than 12 months from the time of latest removal from home
- (2) At least 12 months, but less than 24 months
- (3) At least 24 months, but less than 36 months

(4) At least 36 months, but less than 48 months

(5) 48 or more months

Child Welfare Outcome 7:

Reduce placements of young children in group homes or institutions

Measure 7.1: For all children who entered foster care during the reporting period and were age 12 or younger at the time of their

most recent placement, what percentage was placed in a group home or an institution?

APPENDIX B-2



C-CFSR Outcomes and Indicators

Below is a proposed set of outcomes and indicators, developed by the Child Welfare Outcomes and Accountability Workgroup, in consultation with the Chapin Hall Center for Children.

- The far left column represents the outcome we would like to achieve.
- The second column, "Federal," lists the measures included in the U.S. DHHS' federal review of state child welfare programs, Child and Family Service Review.
- The middle column, "State Enriched," describes the measures that the Workgroup is proposing to use. These measures will supplement the federal measures to provide a more comprehensive understanding of the State's child welfare system.
- The fourth column, "Short-term Development," holds measures we hope to develop for the next cycle of the California Child and Family Service Review. For data reasons, these measures were not available for the first cycle, but are planned for CWS/CMS enhancements.
- The far right column, "Future Development," includes measures we would like to develop for subsequent C-CFSR cycles. These measures are contingent upon larger system changes, such as the implementation of the CDSS CWS Stakeholders' Group's Redesign efforts.

NOTES:

* These indicators were taken directly or adapted from the CWDA list of outcome measures.

Italicized & Bolded indicators measure process

Where possible, we propose that data be reported using these sub-populations.

- Age, by year and/or age group (under 1, 1-2, 3-5, 6-10, 11-15, 16+)
- Type of placement
- Race and ethnicity, and Native American/Indian heritage
- Children with disabilities (to be developed)
- Types of abuse
- Perpetrator

C-CFSR Outcomes and Indicators

PROFILE INFORMATION	Data Collected to Provide Background, Context and Demographics
	<p><u>A. Demographic and Census information by county and/or zip code, including information such as:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • age, race, ethnicity, or Native American/Indian heritage, other basic demographic characteristics • poverty rate • household income • unemployment rate • rate of families with no health insurance • level of education for head of household • receipt of public assistance • active tribes • other <p><u>B. Referral information:</u> Rate of children with initial and/or substantiated report(s) of abuse and/or neglect per 1,000 children in child population by age group, type of abuse, and disposition (e.g. substantiated, inconclusive, unfounded, and evaluated out) county by county.</p> <p><u>C. Abuse in care:</u> Of all children in foster care during the period under review, what percent reported maltreatment by a foster care provider, and of those reports, what was the referral outcome?</p> <p><u>D. Foster care entries:</u> Rate of children entering out-of-home care per 1,000 children, county by county in aggregate form.*</p> <p><u>E. Placement type:</u> Percent of children entering care who are placed in kinship homes, foster family homes, FFA's and group homes for initial and overall placements.*</p> <p><u>F. Child mortality information:</u> Number of child mortalities reported on CWS/CMS matched against vital statistics and other data sources. This data will come from the State Child Death Review Council Reconciliation Project and will be made available on a flow basis.</p>

C-CFSR Outcomes and Indicators

Safety Outcomes	Indicators			
	Federal	State Enriched	Short-term Development	Future Development
1. Children are, first and foremost, protected from abuse and neglect.	<p><u>1A. Recurrence of maltreatment:</u> Of all children who were victims of substantiated or indicated child abuse and/or neglect during the first six months of the reporting period, what percent had another substantiated or indicated report within a six month period?</p> <p><u>1C. Incidence of child abuse and/or neglect in foster care:</u> Of all children in foster care in the State during the period under review, what percent were the subjects of substantiated or indicated maltreatment by a foster parent or facility staff?</p>	<p><u>1B. Recurrence of maltreatment:</u> In the year under review, of all children who had a substantiated report of maltreatment, what percent had a subsequent substantiated report and did it occur within 3, 6, 12, or 24 months? Stratify by 1st report vs. 2nd or subsequent report.</p> <p><u>1D. Incidence of child abuse and/or neglect in foster care:</u> Same as 1C, but adjusted for time in care and type of placement.</p> <p><u>1E. Rate of abuse and/or neglect following permanency:</u> Percent of children with allegation/ substantiated report of abuse or neglect, within 12 months following permanency (guardianship, Kin-GAP, reunification).*</p>		

C-CFSR Outcomes and Indicators

Safety Outcomes	Indicators			
	Federal	State Enriched	Short-term Development	Future Development
2. Children are safely maintained in their homes whenever possible and appropriate.	Source: No quantifiable federal measure available; obtained during review of 50 cases statewide.	<p><u>2A: Recurrence of abuse/neglect in homes where children were not removed:</u> Percent of children with an allegation (inconclusive or substantiated) who were not removed and whose next event was a substantiated allegation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Subsequent substantiated allegation at 3, 6, 12 months (a) after initial report and (b) after case closure By inconclusive vs. substantiated initial allegation By abuse type By perpetrator By receipt of ER services <p><u>2B: Child abuse and neglect referrals by time to investigation:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>% of child abuse and neglect referrals that have resulted in an in-person investigation stratified by IR and 10-day referrals.</i> 	<p><u>2D. Recurrence of abuse/neglect in homes where children were not removed:</u> Percent of children with an allegation (inconclusive or substantiated) who were not removed and whose next event was a substantiated allegation, by receipt of remedial and rehabilitative services that are culturally appropriate.</p> <p><u>2E. Assessment of kin and non-related extended family member homes:</u> % of children in homes that have not had an annual reassessment within 12 months of the initial assessment or latest reassessment.</p> <p>NOTE: 2E is pending CWS/CMS system change.</p>	<p><u>2F: Recurrence of abuse/neglect for at-risk children:</u> Of "enrolled" (i.e., open case with circumstantial abuse/neglect), children & families receiving services, what percent went on to have a substantiated report/allegation?</p> <p>NOTE: 2F is contingent upon implementation of CWS Stakeholders differential response proposal and defining and flagging "enrolled" children on CWS/CMS.</p>

C-CFSR Outcomes and Indicators

Safety Outcomes	Indicators			
	Federal	State Enriched	Short-term Development	Future Development
2. Children are safely maintained in their homes whenever possible and appropriate.		<p><i>2C: Social worker visits: Stratified by program type and visits with child, parents, and caregivers.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>% of cases with monthly social worker visits.</i> • <i>% of cases with a valid visit exception.</i> 		

C-CFSR Outcomes and Indicators

Permanency Outcomes	Indicators			
	Federal	State Enriched	Short-term Development	Future Development
<p>3. Children have permanency and stability in their living situations (State modification: without increasing reentry).</p>	<p>3B. Stability of foster care placement: Of all children who have been in foster care less than 12 months from the time of the latest removal, what percent had no more than two placement settings?</p> <p>3D. Length of time to achieve adoption goal: Of all the children who exited foster care during the period under review to a finalized adoption, what percent exited care in less than 24 months from the time of latest removal from home?</p> <p>3E. Length of time to achieve reunification: Of all children who were reunified with their parents or caretakers at the time of the discharge from foster care, what percent were reunified in less than 12 months from the time of the latest removal from the home?</p> <p>3F. Foster care re-entries: Of all the children who entered care during the year under review, what percent re-entered foster care within 12 months of a prior foster care episode?</p>	<p>3A. Length of time to exit foster care: Of those children in an entry cohort, % exiting foster care within 3, 6, 12, 24, 36, 48, and 60 months of entry.*</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • % exiting to adoption • % exiting to Kin-GAP • % exiting to other guardianship • % exiting to reunification • % exiting to emancipation • % exiting to probation or incarceration • % exiting for other reasons • % still in care <p>3C. Multiple placements: Of those children in an entry cohort, % of those remaining in care with 3,4,5 or more placements within 12, 24, 36, 48, and 60 months.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Frequency and constellations of placements • Reasons for placement change(s) <p>3G. Foster care re-entries: Of children in an entry cohort, for those exiting to <i>reunification or guardianship</i>, % who re-entered care within 12, 24, and 36 months, stratified by time in care 3, 6, 12, 24 months (48 and 60 months for guardianship) of a prior foster care episode.*</p>	<p>3H. Foster care re-entries: Of children in an entry cohort, for those exiting to <i>adoption</i>, % who re-entered care within 12, 24, 36, 48, and 60 months of a prior foster care episode.*</p> <p>3I. Timely court hearings: <i>% of children who have had timely status review hearings, stratified by program type and age.</i></p>	<p>3J. Foster care re-entries: Note: need an enhancement to CWS/CMS to track severity of abuse allegation to access the severity of events that preceded re-entry.</p>

C-CFSR Outcomes and Indicators

Permanency Outcomes	Indicators			
	Federal	State Enriched	Short-term Development	Future Development
4. The continuity of family relationships and connections is preserved for children.	Source: No quantifiable federal measure available; obtained during review of 50 cases statewide.	<p><u>4A. Sibling placements:</u> For each child entering care for the first time, % of their total time in foster care when all siblings were placed together (stratify by # of siblings, and full, ½, or step). Also collect for additional cohort: siblings placed together within 30 days.</p> <p>Of those not placed together, what % of the time were all of them placed with relatives?</p> <p><u>4B. Use of least restrictive care settings:</u> For children entering care, what is the predominant placement type?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • By entry cohort • Stratify by distance • Identify by relative and non-relative placement type <p>NOTE: 4B Program staff will provide methodology for restrictive placement types.</p> <p><u>4C. Identification of Indian heritage:</u> % of children in out-of-home care identified as Native American within 1, 3, 6, 12, or 24 months of removal.</p>		

C-CFSR Outcomes and Indicators

Permanency Outcomes	Indicators			
	Federal	State Enriched	Short-term Development	Future Development
4. The continuity of family relationships and connections is preserved for children.		<p><u>4D. Notification to Tribes:</u> Of those children identified as Native American, % where Tribal notification occurred within 30, 60, or 90 days.</p> <p><u>4E. ICWA placement preferences:</u> Of those children identified as Native American:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • % placed w/ extended family • % placed w/ other members of the child's Tribe • % placed w/ other Indian families • % placed w/ non-Indian families 	<p><i>4F. Visitation between parents and children. % of children who visit their parents. Stratify by program type and visitation frequency i.e., weekly, monthly.</i></p>	

C-CFSR Outcomes and Indicators

Child & Family Well-Being Outcomes	Indicators			
	Federal	State Enriched	Short-term Development	Future Development
5. Children receive adequate services to meet their physical, emotional and mental health needs.	Source: No quantifiable federal measure available; obtained during review of 50 cases statewide.	<p><u>5A. Health information:</u> Percent of children in care more than 30 days with a Health Passport.*</p> <p><u>5B. Receipt of health screenings:</u> Percent of children in care with CHDP, dental exams, psychotropic medications, and immunizations that comply with periodicity table.*</p> <p><u>5C. Receipt of mental health services among those referred:</u> Percent of CWS children with mental health referrals who receive mental health services. Stratify by in-home versus out-of-home care.</p> <p>NOTE: Recommend efforts focus on obtaining these data from health professionals/systems.</p>		<p><u>5D. Prevention services:</u> FM Children receive Health Passport and screenings.</p> <p><u>5E. Receipt of mental health screening:</u> Percent of children in care who received an initial mental health screening within 30 days of initial placement.</p>

C-CFSR Outcomes and Indicators

Child & Family Well-Being Outcomes	Indicators			
	Federal	State Enriched	Short-term Development	Future Development
6. Children receive appropriate services to meet their educational needs.	Source: No quantifiable federal measure available; obtained during review of 50 cases statewide.	<p><u>6A. Education information:</u> % in care more than 30 days with an Health Education Passport and % in care more than 180 days with a complete HEP.*</p> <p><u>6B. School stability, attendance:</u> For children in out of home care for one or more school years*:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • % with school change during year and # of school changes • % of children with IEP. • % of children performing below grade level <p><u>6C. School enrollment:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • % of school aged children enrolled within 1, 2, 3, and 4 weeks or more of initial out-of-home placement • % enrolled within 1, 2, 3, and 4 weeks of a placement change. 	<p><u>6D. School stability, attendance:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • % with adequate (TBD) yearly attendance • # of school days missed • % in non-public schools • % of children enrolled in the same school • Of those children with an IEP, % who receive services <p>NOTE: 6D unavailable via CWS/CMS, and would require data match with education. May require MOU w/ CDE or statutory change.</p>	<p><u>6E. School performance:</u> Percentage of children in care at grade level on standardized state tests (requires match to planned statewide education data); stratified by special and regular education (by entry cohort, age, and placement type).</p>

C-CFSR Outcomes and Indicators

Child & Family Well-Being Outcomes	Indicators			
	Federal	State Enriched	Short-term Development	Future Development
7. Families have enhanced capacity to provide for their children's needs.	Source: No quantifiable federal measure available; obtained during review of 50 cases statewide.		<p><u>7. Receipt of support services</u>: Percentage of parents able to access and use support services identified in case plans, by case closure.</p> <p>NOTE: Post exit survey needed to access 7.</p>	

C-CFSR Outcomes and Indicators

Child & Family Well-Being Outcomes	Indicators			
	Federal	State Enriched	Short-term Development	Future Development
8. Youth emancipating from foster care are prepared to transition to adulthood.		<p>8A. Transition to self-sufficient adulthood: Of youth emancipating from foster care, the percentage *:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> with High School diploma or GED enrolled in college or higher education program with receipt of ILP services who completed a vocational training program are employed or have other means of support <p>NOTE: Data source for this measure is the County ILP report. This data is subject to the limitations of the data reporting form.</p> <p>RECONCILE THIS LIST W/ NATIONAL STANDARDS TO BE RELEASED BY ACF (ie, Chaffee requirements and probation)</p>	<p>8B. Transition to self-sufficient adulthood: Of youth exiting from foster care, the percentage *:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> with a legal emancipation hearing or termination of jurisdiction hearing. with the documents required by AB 686 <p>8C. Self-sufficiency skills training: Of youth in foster care, who completed a Living Skills Assessment, the % who are identified as needing self sufficiency skills training.</p> <p>NOTE: 8C is contingent upon revision of Transitional Independent Living Plan form and changes to CWS/CMS.</p>	<p>8D. Probation or juvenile justice: Of youth in foster care, the percentage *:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> who are on probation or incarcerated.* who are transferred into the juvenile justice system. <p>NOTE: This measure would require a data match the Department of Corrections.</p>